

# CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*

## What the Campaign Did to Religion

For months everyone has been asking about the effect of religion upon the political campaign. The election has not ended the discussion. The days and years to come will see further studies of just how Roman Catholic loyalties and anti-Catholic suspicions intermingled to influence the electorate. But now, following the election, we may appropriately reverse the usual question and ask: What did the political campaign do to religion?

Certainly the campaign made America aware of religion. Professional and amateur pundits discovered that churches and beliefs do, for good and for bad, affect the behavior of people in this "secular" society. Furthermore, the electoral struggle set in motion forces that will work in the history of American religion through a long future. Three aspects of the subject deserve comment.

### I.

The political battles brought out simultaneously the worst and the best in the vast collection of American voices that are loosely called Protestant.

The public saw a painful exhibition of sordid hate and fanaticism. Some of the scurrilous anti-Catholic literature betrayed a spite that many had hopefully thought to be dead in tolerant America. Malicious misquotations, violent prejudice, unreasoning malice had their rampage. The logic of some groups became most absurd when preachers invoked clerical authority to tell their congrega-

tions to vote against Kennedy, because priests might influence him.

It is slight comfort to know that the financing for much of the hate literature came from groups who had no religious motive but wanted to defeat Kennedy for political or economic reasons. Thus bitter churchmen got an audience they could never have reached on their own. The sad fact is that plenty of voices were glad to be used by the irreligious forces.

A happier story was the forthright stand of Protestants who called for elimination of religious prejudice from the campaign. Many Protestant spokesmen supported Kennedy. Some who favored Nixon were just as insistent in rebutting appeals to prejudice. Early in September one hundred prominent churchmen and scholars issued a lucid declaration against voting on the basis of religious affiliation. Much of the church press took the same stand. When some groups sought to make Reformation Day the occasion for political propaganda, leaders of major Protestant denominations denounced this betrayal of the meaning of the festival.

### II.

Roman Catholicism comes out of the campaign with a changed image for many in the American public. If this large and complex Church suffered on some fronts from the awakening of long-dormant hostilities, it won great gains on other fronts. Never before has America received so wide, if in-

Vol. XX, No. 19, November 14, 1960 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

complete, an education in the beliefs and practices of the Roman Church, including some of its internal struggles. Millions, who never before have done so, now think of Catholicism in terms of an intelligent leader, thoroughly committed to religious liberty and separation of Church and State.

The change means more than a modified public image. It may affect deeply the inner evolution of Catholicism and its cultural role in America.

For a century the Roman Church has struggled over its response to modern political liberalism and democracy. Pius IX in the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) and Leo XIII in *The Christian Constitution of States* (1885) expressed opposition to religious liberty, to freedom of state and public education from ecclesiastical control, and to "progress, liberalism and modern civilization." In the United States the oft-quoted text, *Catholic Principles of Politics* by Ryan and Boland, has argued for a modified form of this belief. Protestants and secularists could rightly worry about such doctrine. It was no adequate answer to reply to their questions by shouting "Bigotry."

A valid answer was to point out that much contemporary Catholicism has moved as far from the nineteenth-century encyclicals as Protestantism has moved from Calvin's Geneva. From the Vatican itself, from the American bishops, from prominent Catholic scholars have come a series of declarations over the years, sometimes moderating, sometimes boldly changing the older tradition. If it can truthfully be said that Roman Catholicism (like all big institutions) contains sharply conflicting beliefs, it can now be said also that the political campaign has strengthened the liberal forces.

Thus the distinguished Jesuit, the Rev. Gustave Weigel, spoke emphatically for the independence of political leaders from domination by Pope or priest. A comparable declaration came from 165 prominent Roman Catholic laymen, including scholars, journalists and politicians. When the three Puerto Rican bishops "prohibited" Catholics from voting for Governor Luis Muñoz Marín, the revulsion among U.S. Catholics was instantaneous. Cardinal Spellman and others said that there would be no sin in disobeying the bishops.

This rallying of voices will inevitably affect the Roman Catholic future. In many a local area churchmen who have been asserting ecclesiastical control over schools and political institutions will be thrown on the defensive. Some laymen, who

have been chafing under authoritative priests, will see that these priests act in opposition to highly respected Catholic leaders.

One might cautiously hazard a still more radical prediction. The campaign of 1960 may well mark a step in the transition of American Catholicism into the status of simply one more denomination. *Theologically* Roman Catholicism claims to be the true Church, vested with infallibility in matters of faith and morals, beside which all other Christian groups are pseudo-churches. *Sociologically* and *politically* it takes its place as one church in the midst of a religious pluralism which it endorses. These two propositions may be logically compatible. Probably they are culturally and psychologically irreconcilable in the American future.

### III.

Finally we must ask what the campaign did to the ethical significance of religion in American society. Here the verdict is a mixed one. The forces that worked against fanaticism simultaneously delivered some damaging blows to the ethical significance of religion.

In political campaigns all arguments—whether about foreign policy, economics or religion—get simplified, sometimes disastrously. In recent months the easiest answer to intolerance has been to say that religion is irrelevant to politics. That answer, though false to the meaning of faith, resounded through the campaign.

In view of the devious and malicious devices of some fanatics, we must not judge too harshly Senator Kennedy's efforts at reply. But we must say that they were often inadequate. On occasion he asked voters whether they would deny him the Presidency because of the way he was baptized as a baby. We may hope that Mr. Kennedy's Roman Catholic Christianity is a matter of his present conviction, not an accident that happened when he was too young to stop it. Likewise we may hope that he was mistaken when, in accepting the Democratic nomination, he hammered on the irrelevance of religion to the exercise of public office. At the famous meeting with the Houston clergy, he said, in the midst of many fine things: "I believe in a President whose views on religion are his own private affair."

Such statements, echoed by many Protestants, contribute to a picture of religion as a cozy affair

of pretty customs or of purely private relations with God. Even more devastating was the comment to the press of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, supporting Vice-President Nixon by saying of his Quaker faith, "I don't know that he ever let it bother him."

Even the learned and able Father Weigel went to dangerous extremes in declaring that political matters "belong not to the order of morality and piety but to the order of law." This would seem to be a curious Catholic capitulation to the Lutheran doctrine of the two realms at precisely its most vulnerable point.

Christianity may not, without apostasy, surrender its biblical and traditional heritage, which asserts that all of life belongs to God and that faith concerns all decisions. We may rightly recognize that the political leader acts in a representative capacity, where he must consider his responsibility to a society. He cannot take guidance solely from his private conscience and religion or from the clergy of his Church. But religion, certainly in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, concerns ethics. And ethics concerns public policy.

If the Christian conscience settles for the irrelevance of faith to politics, it surrenders to doctrines of expediency or to the pseudo-religion of secular nationalism. Churchmen were right in the campaign when they insisted that the relevance of religion was not at the point of labels. Intelligent political argument deals with political issues. But that genuine victory of understanding must not come at the cost of succumbing to the popular mood, which says that religion is not important enough to matter.

One fascinating memory of the campaign is that of a room full of Protestant theologians trying, with no sign of success, to persuade a Jesuit to vote for Kennedy. No one was saying that religion was unimportant. Everyone was attempting the difficult, but perpetually necessary task of thinking rigorously about political issues within a context of Christian concern.

R. L. S.

## FOR FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

**N**OW THAT the elections are over, Americans have turned to their favorite post-election pastime—analyzing the whys and wherefores of its results. One group that has been enormously helpful in recent years in analyzing and reporting the less savory side of electioneering has been the Fair Campaign Practices Committee (FCPC).

The Committee, which is non-partisan and privately supported, is ably led by its Chairman, Charles P. Taft, former mayor of Cincinnati and brother of the late Ohio Senator, and its Executive Director, Bruce L. Felknor. It has provided considerable assistance to the public through its educational program, which attempts to acquaint the voter with the major unfair campaign tactics—anonymous literature, undocumented charges, trick photography, outdated quotes or ones that are taken out of context, etc. In 1956 and 1958, the Committee, working through the state party chairmen and, where possible, through political scientists and newspaper editors, conducted studies of the use of unfair tactics with quite interesting results, which we shall presently discuss.

Unfortunately, it is not clear at this writing that the FCPC will be in a position to carry out its biennial state-by-state survey of the use of smear tactics in the campaign. Two weeks before the election—at the height of its greatest usefulness, since some of the worst tactics are saved for the last days when they cannot be adequately dealt with—FCPC was \$25,000 in the red, and its paid staff of two had voluntarily gone on half-salary.

From our point of view this news was disconcerting. The Committee has been quite successful in uncovering and focussing public attention on much of the anti-Catholic literature that engulfed the nation this fall. Late in the campaign it revealed that, since August 2, only two days had not seen the appearance of a new tract. It also exposed false and anonymous anti-Nixon hate literature that charged the Vice President with anti-Semitic and anti-Negro beliefs.

Much of the offensive material uncovered in the 1956 and 1958 surveys originated outside the parties and the responsible campaign organizations, and was local in effect and origin. The 1958 study discovered that the number of charges of unfair tactics had doubled over 1956. A substantial increase was also noted in the incidence of smears based on race and religion—Roman Catholics were increasingly the target.

One hopeful fact revealed by the surveys was that the use of unfair practices backfired to a greater degree in 1958 (55 per cent) than in 1956 (33 per cent). Also, candidates who hesitated to defend themselves, for fear of spreading the original smear in the process of refuting it, were given encouragement. The 1958 survey pointed out that eight of the nine particular candidates studied who were victims of smear tactics and who met



them head-on and made a major campaign issue of them were elected.

We do not look forward to reading this year's report, for we are certain that it will be a reminder of the continuing immaturity of a portion of the American electorate. We are, however, great-

ly concerned that the FCPC receive support sufficient to carry forward its program. The work of the FCPC deserves the attention and support of the electorate—if it fails, only the forces of organized ignorance stand to gain.

W. H. C.

## The Protestant Spirit

WE HAVE RECENTLY lived through a "Reformation Sunday" that in many corners of American Protestantism could have been described more accurately as "Anti-Catholic Sunday." The positive faith for which our forebears died seems to have been reduced to the injunction, "No Catholic in the White House."

The presence of this attitude of negativism and fear makes it necessary to ask once again what it means to be a Protestant. We must be able to say more than that being a Protestant is a frantic form of *not* being a Catholic. The "more" that we are able to say might best be suggested by juxtaposing two biblical statements—a Protestant procedure if there ever was one—which suggest that Protestantism is *constant renewal at the hand of God*.

On the one hand, Protestantism is a faith with a center and a content: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever" (Heb. 13:8). On the other hand, we can never claim this faith as a cozy possession, a "sure thing" that involves no risk: "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us" (2 Cor. 4:7).

There is a treasure, but it is a treasure that comes to us in earthen vessels. Earthen vessels can easily be smashed. They often need to be smashed in order that they may be re-made. Thus there can be *constant renewal*, but since "the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us," it will always be *constant renewal at the hand of God*.

There are a number of ways in which we may illustrate this understanding of the spirit of Protestantism.

The earliest Christians could proclaim their faith with the two words *Kurios Christos*, Christ is Lord. This is the most positive way of describ-

ing the spirit of Protestantism. It is allegiance to Jesus Christ as Lord. To acknowledge anyone as "Lord" is to acknowledge that he is supreme and that he occupies a place no one else can occupy. To acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord is therefore to acknowledge that he is the one who is supreme, and that he occupies the place no one else can occupy. There can be no other Lord if he is truly Lord.

Professor Albert Outler, in *The Christian Tradition and the Unity We Seek* (Oxford University Press), has given a telling example of what this means for the life of the Church. He describes a church in Ystad, Sweden, of fairly conventional design save that on the pillar opposite the pulpit stands a crucifix, life-size and life-like, "with human hair matted under the crown of actual thorns." Why this strange arrangement?

The story, as it turned out, goes back to a visit to Ystad, and to this Mariakyrchen, of the great warrior hero king, Charles XII, in 1716. The visit was unexpected, and the pastor was so overwhelmed by this sudden burst of glory that he put aside his prescribed text and substituted an ardent eulogy of the king and royal family. Some few months later, the Church received a gift from King Charles. It was this second crucifix, and with it these instructions: "This is to hang on the pillar opposite the pulpit, so that all who shall stand there will be reminded of their proper subject" (p. 141).

The historian Herbert Butterfield concludes his *Christianity and History* (Bell) with the surprising advice, "Hold fast to Christ, and for the rest be totally uncommitted." The advice is initially jarring, but, properly understood, it could almost be said to epitomize the spirit of Protestantism, for it affirms the Lordship of Christ and excludes the possibility of rival "lords." To be "totally committed" to anyone other than Christ is, in fact, to

Dr. Brown is a member of the Editorial Board. He and Gustave Welgel, S.J., are currently continuing their dialogue, initiated in *An American Dialogue* (Doubleday), over NBC radio. The material in this article will appear in more extended form in *The Spirit of Protestantism*, to be published next spring by Oxford University Press.

dethrone Christ, and to enthrone some rival in his place.

### The Protestant Principle

But it always is our temptation to enthrone some rival in his place. And against this temptation stands the first commandment, a commandment that expresses the spirit of Protestantism from a second perspective: "You shall have no other gods before me" (Ex. 20:3). To put "other gods" before the Lord is to succumb to the sin of idolatry, the worshipping of "idols" or false gods. This theme has been given most persuasive elaboration in our day by Professor Tillich in what he calls "the Protestant principle." This is the insistence that no partial object of loyalty may be transformed into an ultimate object of loyalty; nothing man-made, or less than divine, may be treated as though it were divine. The Protestant principle, he writes,

contains the divine and human protest against any absolute claim made for a relative reality, even if this claim is made by a Protestant church. The Protestant principle is the judge of every religious and cultural reality, including the religion and culture which calls itself "Protestant." . . . It is the guardian against all the attempts of the finite and conditioned to usurp the place of the unconditional in thinking and acting. It is the prophetic judgment against religious pride, ecclesiastical arrogance, and secular self-sufficiency and their destructive consequences.

(*The Protestant Era*, University of Chicago Press, p. 163)

Now this sin of idolatry is the characteristic religious temptation of the twentieth century. We see it most clearly in the idolatrous claims that are made on behalf of a nation, a tendency given classic expression by Stephen Decatur: "My country right or wrong, may she be right, but right or wrong my country." To say this is to break the first commandment. Indeed, we must add that if those who told us during the recent campaign that it is wrong to criticize America really meant it, they, too, were counselling us to break the first commandment.

The Protestant alternative to "My country right or wrong" is indicated by the first declaration of the Barmen Conference of 1934, one of the truly great utterances of modern church history. In this statement, Protestant Christians in Germany demonstrated that an obedience to the first command-

ment and an affirmation of the Lordship of Jesus Christ meant a denial of all other claimants:

Jesus Christ, as he is attested to us in Holy Scripture, is the one Word of God, whom we have to hear and whom we have to trust and obey in life and in death.

We condemn the false doctrine that the Church can and must recognize as God's revelation other events and powers, forms and truths apart from and alongside this one Word of God.

Christ is Lord, so Hitler cannot be Lord. "Other events and powers" (Hitler, Nazism, anti-Semitism) must be repudiated.

This is not a new idea. We may recall that the apparently inoffensive theological formula of the first century, *Kurios Christos* (Christ is Lord), was loaded with political consequences. In the first century, inhabitants of the Roman Empire were required to confess a different faith: *Kurios Caesar*, Caesar is Lord. This meant that the Christian affirmation actually involved two things. It not only meant "Christ is Lord;" it also meant "Caesar is not Lord." The Roman officials were quite aware of the political overtones of the confessional statement, and Christians who were captured by the state were persecuted unless they would swear, in a total lack of ambiguity, *Kurios Caesar*, *anathema Christos* (Caesar is Lord, Christ is accursed).

### The Reformation Must Continue

But it is relatively easy for Protestants to point a prophetic finger at "secular" idolatries, and to call down judgment on those who say, "My country right or wrong," or "My corporation right or wrong." It is not easy for Protestants to repudiate the attitude that says, "My church right or wrong." The finger of judgment must be pointed inward as well as outward, for the Church *in its own life* is always betraying the Lordship of Christ and breaking the commandment, "You shall have no other gods before me."

There is a clear scriptural mandate concerning this. It goes, unambiguously, disconcertingly and disturbingly: "The time has come for judgment to begin with the household of God" (1 Pet. 4:17). At no time is the Church in greater peril than when, fighting against idolatry without, it succumbs to idolatry within. "We must fight their falsehood with our truth," Reinhold Niebuhr has admirably put it, but, as he has even more admirably continued, "we must also fight the falsehood

in our truth." The same concern can be put in the well-known phrase, "the Reformation must continue," or in the less well-known but equally important phrase, *Ecclesia reformata sed semper reformanda* (the Church reformed, but always to be reformed). The notion that the Reformation is complete, or even that it can ever be completed, is a denial of what "reformation" in the Protestant sense really means.

Now this is perhaps the ultimate issue dividing Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—and it is a lot more worthy of discussion on both sides than the question of the religious affiliation of the incumbent of the White House. For the Roman Catholic could surely agree with most or much of what has been said thus far, particularly the judgment on secular idolatries. But when the judgment turns to a radical judgment *upon the church*, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant would begin to part company.

The Roman Catholic would have to insist that the Church does not need reformation in any basic sense, that by its very nature it is irreformable, and that its dogmas are infallible. The notion behind this insistence, e.g., that the words of human beings can be unequivocally equated with the words of God, is precisely what the Protestant must deny. Visser 't Hooft points out that Roman Catholicism can allow for the possibility of reforms *in the Church*, the cleansing of aspects in the Church's life that have gotten tarnished. But it cannot allow for the possibility of reform *of the Church*, the recognition that, at the very basis of its being, the Church may need to be shaken, judged, purged and re-made.

Protestantism, on the contrary, affirms at its best that the Church *must* be shaken, judged, purged and re-made. It cannot be renewed once. Its life must be a life of constant renewal, for it is an *ecclesia peccatorum*, a Church of sinners, a Church that is constantly failing to fulfill its high calling. And whereas both Catholics and Protestants can agree that the Church is "a community of sinners," the Protestant must unfailingly go on to say that the Church is also "a sinful community." The Church, then, is not exempt from God's judgment. The Church is the place where God's judgment is most severe.

Now it is often the case that Protestantism becomes so entrenched in its own ways of doing and thinking that it can only be dislodged by pressures from without. "Good pagans" often exhibit a greater sense of responsibility for social reform, for ex-

ample, than do good Christians. And Protestants must have enough grace to acknowledge this and be willing to learn, from whatever source, something of their own responsibility before God. If the Church does not continue to be reformed from within, we can be sure that God will reform it from without. As Professor Bennett has written:

Often unwelcome pressure on the Church from outside has proved to be necessary to shake it out of quite unholy ruts. I doubt if the Church, either Catholic or Protestant, without such pressure, would ever have accepted fully and ungrudgingly the principle of religious liberty for all citizens in a country. . . . Correction of the Church from outside is a costly process but it is often necessary, and the Christian who sees truth in these tendencies and movements which may even be hostile to the Church has a responsibility to represent that truth within the Church.

(in Ferm, ed., *The Protestant Credo*, Philosophical Library, p. 136)

### Treasure in Earthen Vessels

Thus far three things have been suggested as contributing to the formation of the spirit of Protestantism: a recognition of the Lordship of Christ, a recognition that "You shall have no other gods before me," and a recognition that "the Reformation must continue." We can sum up the discussion by referring again to the two texts that the above emphases have been trying to illustrate.

The content of the Christian gospel, the *raison d'être* of Protestantism, is a conviction that "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever." He does not change. He has been, he is, he will continue to be. But this fact about Jesus Christ must be related to a fact about ourselves. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever, "but we have this treasure in earthen vessels to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us."

The fact of Jesus Christ assures us that there *can* be constant renewal at the hand of God. The fact that we have this treasure in earthen vessels reminds us that there will always *need* to be constant renewal at the hand of God.

The danger inherent in sectarian Christianity is that it will assume that the treasure can be possessed apart from the earthen vessels, and that therefore the vessels are no longer necessary. The danger inherent in Roman Catholicism is that it will equate the treasure and the earthen vessels,



and that it will therefore assert that the vessels are no longer earthen.

And while there is no assurance that Protestantism will not continually be impaled on one or another of the horns of this dilemma, there is always here a great evangelical possibility and responsibility for Protestantism. For at its best, Protestantism can recognize both that there is a treasure, Jesus Christ, and that this treasure is mediated to us through earthen vessels. Without the treasure, Protestantism is nothing. But without the recognition that its vessels are earthen, Protestantism betrays the treasure and forgets that "the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us."

This means that the Protestant approach to living, our "style of life," is not easy to describe, but that it has its own inner authenticity and integrity. It means an assurance about God coupled with a diffidence concerning any reports we make about God. It means that we can trust God utterly, but that we will never trust any human account of God utterly. It means that we can be committed, but that statements about our commitment must always be tentative. It means an ultimate security but not an immediate security. The Protestant venture is a risk, but it is a risk in the context of a promise, a trust in God but not in man.

We can therefore be grateful that the treasure comes in earthen vessels and that they remain earthen. Our hope does not lie in the fact that the transcendent power will someday belong to us. It lies in the fact that the transcendent power will never belong to us, but that it belongs to God—the God who meets our sin with his grace, and who meets our misuse of his grace with his healing and corrective power.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### The Infallible Voice

TO THE EDITORS: Mr. Callahan's article of October 3 on "Freedom and Authority in Roman Catholicism" described most helpfully the ambiguities in the Catholic understanding of the Church-State relationship.

However, it brought to the foreground of my Protestant mind a non-political question which, for the sake of brevity, I state with undiplomatic bluntness. Is it possible that Catholicism seeks the theological and psychological benefits of infallibility without wishing to accept the risks and responsibilities accompanying that claim?

Catholicism speaks in confident tones of its own infallibility over against the kaleidoscopic confusion of Protestantism. Yet when specific cases are

raised it is extraordinarily difficult to determine what the Infallible Voice has said.

This is striking in the Church-State debate. The problem has been discussed for centuries. Papal pronouncements are abundant. Yet, apparently, no one is able to state what the Voice has said. Personally I am glad this is the case, but I am puzzled about the real significance of infallibility. If the "human situation" requires the intervention of an Infallible Voice in order that the Scriptures may be interpreted and the will of God understood, then surely it is necessary for that Voice to be intelligible—or else the need that has been alleged has not been met.

Doubtless my questions reflect a Protestant inability to understand what the concept of Papal Infallibility means to a Catholic. Yet, to me, the one who claims there is a magnificent sword within the sheath must be willing to wield that sword when occasion arises.

PROF. HARVEY K. MACARTHUR  
Hartford Theological Seminary  
Hartford, Conn.

### Mr. Callahan Replies

TO THE EDITORS: Let me say at the outset that Prof. McArthur's questions, in content and tone, seem to me perfect models of the kinds of questions we Catholics and Protestants ought to address to one another. They are relevant questions, first of all. No less important, they show an all too rare sensitivity to the subtle but real distinction between what the objective truth of a doctrine might be and what it "means" to the one who holds it.

Now I believe that the first thing that needs to be said about the "real significance of infallibility" for the Catholic is that it is not thought of as a doctrine that takes all the uncertainty out of life or theology. Its purpose is neither peace of mind nor tactical supremacy in religious warfare. In the theoretical sphere, the Catholic looks upon the doctrine as affirming that, in matters of faith and morals, the Pope will not err when he solemnly defines the faith of the Church. In the practical sphere, the doctrine is looked upon as a guarantee that, when it seems absolutely necessary or desirable, the Church does have a final way of resolving disputes and settling controverted matters.

The doctrine is, consequently, seen as an exceptional way of settling issues rather than as a normal way. What this means—once again speaking practically—is that the Catholic simply does not ask, every time the Pope speaks, whether he speaks infallibly. For one thing the Catholic knows that it is a very rare thing for the Pope to enunciate new doctrine; we expect, ordinarily, that he will exercise his power to teach and clarify but only rarely his extraordinary power to speak infallibly. For another, the Catholic does not always, or even frequently, feel so bothered by divergent opinions in the Church that he will want a final decision.

It is not, however, impossibly difficult for the Catholic to determine when the Pope has spoken

infallibly. There are instances (such as the definition of the Dogma of the Assumption in 1950) that quite clearly meet the requirements specified by the Vatican Council. There are other instances (such as informal addresses) that quite clearly do not. In between, of course, is an indeterminate area. Here, the difficulty is that there is no *simple* decision-procedure, not that there is none at all. Papal teaching concerning the relationship of Church and State almost invariably falls into the middle area. The presumption, too, on the part of most Catholics, so it seems to me, is that pronouncements that fulfill the requirements of the Vatican Council are as rare in matters of Church and State as in any other.

Still, the question seems to be whether this state of affairs (partial uncertainty) is compatible with a doctrine of infallibility. The answer to this question seems to me to depend on one's assumptions about such a doctrine. The answer is surely a resounding "no" if one assumes that the doctrine is intended solely to provide psychological comfort and theological escapism. A reasonable "yes" is possible, however, if one assumes that the doctrine was defined by the Council as part of the normal course of doctrinal development; that, rightly or wrongly, it was a theological decision made on theological grounds. This latter assumption does not preclude the possibility that the definition will introduce new difficulties and require further clarification. So it has always been in the history of dogma.

DANIEL J. CALLAHAN  
Teaching Fellow  
Harvard Divinity School  
Cambridge, Mass.

#### The Enclosed Christmas Envelope

will bring your friends a paperbound copy of *Facing Protestant-Roman Catholic Tensions* and a subscription to *C & C* for one year (\$4.00) or six months (\$2.50).

An early order will guarantee delivery of your gift *just before* Christmas. An attractive card announcing your gift will be enclosed with the book.

Remember that your gift will not only be an appropriate *Christmas* gift, but will also give you an opportunity to share *C & C* with thoughtful friends.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRY  
PHILOSOPHY-REL-EDU-HER  
5201 WOODWARD AVE  
DETROIT 2 MICH  
1714

## False Impressions

TO THE EDITORS: I would like to correct a few false impressions created by Senator Kenneth B. Keating in "Why I Will Vote Republican" (Oct. 17 issue).

(1) The armed services were not desegregated by President Eisenhower. President Truman issued an executive order in 1948 to desegregate the armed forces, and this order was carried out in all branches by 1952.

(2) It is true that "more Americans are at work than at any time in our history," but it is also true that more Americans are unemployed than at any time in our history. Both these facts are due to the population increase. The *per cent* unemployed is what hurts the nation, and under the Eisenhower administration this has gone as high as at any time since the Depression (eight per cent in 1958).

(3) Americans are not "building at an unprecedented rate." The record year for home building was 1950. . . . The current rate of home building is 30 per cent lower than the 1950 rate.

(4) If we have not conceded "an inch of our territory" to the Russians, we have certainly lost influence over many inches of other peoples' territory (Cuba, Indochina, etc.).

PROF. ERDMAN B. PALMORE  
Yale University  
New Haven, Conn.

## CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*  
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*  
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*  
ROBERT G. BATSON, *Assistant Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER  
ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON  
ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE  
TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN  
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY  
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS  
WILLIAM F. MAY J. B. DUROSELLE  
PAUL H. NITZE SIDNEY LANIER  
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

### CONTENTS

THE PROTESTANT SPIRIT

ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN